



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,696	02/18/2004	Erwin Simmacher	69643.001500	9538
21967 7590 08/05/2008 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109			EXAMINER MEHTA, PARIKHA SOLANKI	
			ART UNIT 3737	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/779,696

Applicant(s)

SIMNACHER, ERWIN

Examiner

PARIKHA S. MEHTA

Art Unit

3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/12/08

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 12 March 2008 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the listing of part numbers on pages 7-8 is superfluous and should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-12 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2 defines the structure of the claimed apparatus in terms of elements which are not claimed. Specifically, claim 2 defines the piezoelectric fibers as being "positioned towards said area to be treated", wherein the "area to be treated" is not part of the inventive structure.

Claim 3 recites "fibers...form at least one module", wherein it is unclear exactly what structural limitation is being placed upon the claimed invention in view of the recitation of "form".

Claim 4 fails to further limit the structure of the claimed invention. Examiner notes that any arbitrary object in space can be interpreted as forming a "spatial unit", and as such this limitation is considered inherent in the structure set forth in claim 3.

Claims 6 and 10-12 fail to further limit the structure of the claimed apparatus, as they recite nothing more than limitations directed towards the method by which the apparatus was made.

In line 2 of claims 7 and 8, the word "module" should be corrected to read "modules".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims recite an apparatus for generating shockwaves comprising only piezoelectric fibers and a composite material, with no accompanying power source. The disclosure also describes this embodiment. However, it is not apparent to a skilled artisan how this embodiment would be capable of generating shockwaves, as alleged by the disclosure and claims, without some sort of power source.

The specification goes on to describe an embodiment wherein the piezoelectric fibers ("shockwave generators") are connected to a voltage source that is capable of generating the shock waves. This disclosure contradicts Applicant's earlier disclosure that the fibers and composite material constitute the shockwave source. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be clearly and reasonably apprised of how to make and use a shockwave generator according to the present specification, since it is unclear as to exactly which part of the invention generates the shock waves.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: a shockwave source connected to the piezoelectric fibers and composite material. Piezoelectric fibers and composite material alone are not capable of generating shock waves, as is claimed in the preamble of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 3737

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hagood IV et al (US Patent No. 5,869,189), hereinafter Hagood ('189).

Hagood ('189) discloses an apparatus capable of transmitting shockwaves when connected to a standard shockwave source, the apparatus comprising piezoelectric fibers 16 integrated in a composite material 14 (Abstract, col. 2 lines 1-10), wherein the fibers are arranged such that their lengthwise direction is positioned towards the direction of propagation of the waves (col. 3 lines 17-28), and wherein the fibers and composite material together form a module of a geometric form (Fig. 1) that also constitutes a spatial unit. Hagood ('189) further discloses an embodiment wherein several modules are arranged next to one another (col. 3 lines 2-5) and contacted on respective terminals of the fibers, the terminals including an electrical connection (col. 3 line 66 - col. 4 line 6, col. 5 lines 21-24). Hagood ('189) also includes a carrier 22 containing the electrical connection upon which the modules are arranged (col. 4 lines 22-25, "connection...at the edge").

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PARIKHA S. MEHTA whose telephone number is (571)272-3248. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571.272.4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3737

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ruth S. Smith/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3737

/Parikha S Mehta/

Examiner, Art Unit 3737